UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO		
10/589,989	01/11/2007	Paolo Monti	294552US6X PCT	2476	
	7590 09/12/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER			
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ANDRISH, SEAN D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3672		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			09/12/2011	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/589,989	MONTI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SEAN ANDRISH	3672		

	SEAN ANDRISH	3672	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid aban , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interthan SIX MONTHS from the mailing one. One of the contract of t	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the street forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 August 2011</u> . A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	y extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		npliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17 - 26, 28, and 33 - 38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 1.2 The first in the second	rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	∌d.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Sunil Singh/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3672	

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that Bertaccini teaches supporting a pipeline at a fixed elevated position and that the support structure as taught by Bertaccini completely limits the transversal movement of the pipeline. Examiner replies that Bertaccini teaches a pawl mechanism to move the wedge upon which the pipeline rests upwards on the inclined surface (a transversal movement) of the structure. Examiner relies upon Hellerman to teach a spring-loaded pawl that allows for both upward and downward movement of the wedge, It would have been obvious to modify the pawl as taught by Bertaccini to include the spring-loading mechanism of a pawl as taught by Hellerman to allow the wedge to be lowered so that the support structure can be used at another location or to lower the wedge if the wedge was erroneously raised to a height in excess of the desired height.

Applicant argues that the transversal downward movement of the pipeline on the upper surfaces of the support takes place in a passive manner whereas Bertaccini and Hellerman both teach the movement is achieved in an active way. Examiner replies that passive movement is not claimed. Furthermore, only the upward movement of the pipeline as taught by Bertaccini and Hellerman takes place in an active way. When the wedge of Bertaccini is lowered, the only forces acting upon the pipeline are a lateral force in relation to a weight of the pipeline and an inclination angle of the upper surfaces.

Applicant argues that support system of Bertaccini generates forces that prevent movement of pipelines in case of buckling. As described above, Hellerman teaches a pawl that may be used to lower the wedge of Bertaccini and move the pipeline in a downward, transverse direction along the upper surfaces of the support in a manner that is identical to that of the present application.

/Sunil Singh/